*v. White,* 64 N. H. 48. Nor do these rules violate the constitutional provision guaranteeing liberty in religious profession and worship. *Reynolds v. U. S.,* 98 U. S. 145. The furnishing of medical aid by a parent to his minor child is required by the common law. *Reg. v. Wagstaffe,* 10 Cox C. C. 530, and by statute both in England, 31 and 32 Vict., c. 122, sec. 37, and in most of the states. So that there is a strict analogy between this case and *Reynolds v. U. S., supra.* where the provision in the constitution for liberty of religious profession was held not to shield the crime of bigamy. See also XIII *Yale Law Journal,* 42.

CRIMINAL LAW—EVIDENCE—FACTS RELEVANT—CONDUCT OF BLOODHOUNDS. —BROTT V. STATE, 97 N. W. 293 (NEB.).—*Held,* that the mere trailing of bloodhounds from the place where a crime is committed to the house of the accused is not proof sufficient to infer the commission of the crime therefrom.

Courts have taken notice of the power of bloodhounds to follow a man's trail, and evidence of their conduct is usually admitted as establishing the man's identity. *Hodge v. State,* 98 Ala. 10. In *Simpson v. State,* 111 Ala. 6, similar evidence was admitted without question, and the court went so far as to exclude evidence proving the unreliability of other dogs of the same breed and trained by the same man. But evidence of bloodhounds' trailing should be admitted only where circumstances were most favorable to enable them to track, and then only as a circumstance tending to connect the accused with the crime. *Pedigo v. Commonwealth,* 44 S. W. 143.

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYES—RIGHT TO EMPLOY—INJUNCTION.—ATKINS V. FLETCHER CO., 55 ATL. 1074 (N. J.).—Complainants, being members of a machinists' association on strike, sought to restrain the defendants from interfering with their pickets. *Held,* the right of a voluntary association engaged in supporting a strike, to freedom in the labor market so that the association can readily employ pickets, is not a proper subject of protection by injunction.

In all cases heretofore the question of interference has been raised by the employers. And the law is well settled that where the defendants induced the plaintiff's employes to leave his service by using force, threats or intimidation, the act constituted an injury to property which a court of equity has jurisdiction to restrain by injunction. *Davis v. Zimmerman,* 91 Hun. 489; *Frank v. Herold,* 63 N. J. Eq. 443. In the principal case, it is the union which seeks the freedom of the labor market and, in view of the statement by the learned judge that "the complainants are before the court as employers," the decision seems to be in conflict with settled principles.

EVIDENCE—JOURNALS OF LEGISLATURE—COMPETENCY—ALTERATION BY PAROL. —TOWN OF WILSON V. MARKLEY, 45 S. E. 1023 (N. C.).—Where the question is whether a bill is passed in accordance with constitutional provisions requiring it to be read three times, *held,* that the journal imports absolute verity and cannot be altered or explained by parol.

*Bank v. Commissioners,* 119 N. C. 214, the case most nearly in point, supports the decision, holding the journal conclusive evidence as to whether the roll was called in accordance with constitutional provisions. In harmony with the main decision are also *McCulloch v. State,* 11 Ind. 424; *Burr & Co.*